REMARKS

Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 10-27 are pending in this application, with Claims 10 and 18 being the independent claims. Claims 10 and 18 have been amended herein, and Claims 1-9 were previously canceled. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Before proceeding with the merits of the previously proffered rejections, Applicant would like to gratefully acknowledge Examiner Amini's courtesy in granting and conducting an interview with the undersigned on July 14, 2005. It is believed that the amendments presented herein address the issues discussed during the interview.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 10, 13, 15-23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,317,128 (Harrison et al.), and Claims 11, 12, 14, 24, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Harrison et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,118,427 (Buxton et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 10-17

Independent Claim 10, which relates to a dynamic layering mode of displaying a plurality of data categories, has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "said processor further configured to receive data representative of a predefined event and, upon receipt thereof, to superimpose said second visual representation of said second data category over said first visual representation of said first data category such that the second visual representation masks said first visual representation in said first common region."

Applicant submits that neither Harrison et al. nor Buxton et al. disclose, or even remotely suggest, a processor that is configured to receive data representative of a predefined event and, upon receipt thereof, to mask one visual representation with another visual presentation in common regions. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 10 and the claims that depend therefrom (i.e., Claims 11-17) are not

anticipated by Harrison et al. nor rendered obvious by Harrison et al. and Buxton et al.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of Claims 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 18-27

Independent Claim 18, which relates to a color prioritization mode of displaying a plurality of data categories, has been cosmetically amended to even more clearly define the inventive features. Specifically, Claim 18 now recites, , *inter alia*: wherein: said first color that corresponds to a first priority, said second color corresponds to a second priority, a first color difference between said first color and a background color of said display is greater than about seventy-five, and a second color difference between said second color and said background color is less than about seventy-five.

As is pointed out in the Office action, Harrison et al. illustrates in Figs. 4-5A several menus with 20% foreground and 80% background combined transparency. However, nowhere do either Harrison et al. or Buxton et al., either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a color differences, as recited in independent Claim 18.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 18 and the claims that depend therefrom (i.e., Claims 19-27) are neither anticipated by Harrison et al. nor rendered obvious by Harrison et al. and Buxton et al.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 18-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 10 and 18 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Appl. No. 09/833,944
Amdt. Dated July 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2005

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 7/18/05

By: _____
Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060